



1PW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Jeffery Rodgers, et al.) Examiner: Nguyen, Dang (Michael) T.
Serial No.: 10/759,510) Art Unit: 2828
Filed: January 15, 2004) Our Ref: B-4757NP 621648-9
For: "Method and Apparatus for) **Re: Response**
Coherently Combining....")
Date: March 27, 2006

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to Official Action dated March 9, 2006.

In the Official Action the Examiner sets forth Election of Species Requirement asserting that Claims 8, 17 and 29 falls into Species (I) while Claims 9, 18, and 30 fall into Species (II).

The applicant hereby provisionally elects the Claims of Species (II) for examination in this Application. However, given the fact the Election of Species Requirement, at the very best (from the Examiner's point of view) only withdraws three (3) Claims from examination in this Application, it is not understood why the Examiner is bothering to issue an Election of Species Requirement given the fact that there are thirty-four (34) Claims pending in this Application, and therefore, the number of Claims to be examined only goes from 34 to 31 and that only occurs if